

**INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ, P.C.**

7150 E. CAMELBACK, SUITE 325

SCOTTSDALE, ARIZONA 85251

Telephone: (480) 385-5060

Facsimile: (480) 385-5061

**RECEIVED**  
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER****SEP 26 2005****FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET**

TO:	FROM: <i>pc R</i>
Examiner D. D. Knepper	Alexander B. Ching, Reg. No. 41,669
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2005
FACSIMILE NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
571.273.8300	23
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	462-99-015-5542
RE:	RECIPIENTS REFERENCE NUMBER:
Appeal Brief - Patents	09/709,809

URGENT

FOR REVIEW

PLEASE COMMENT

PLEASE REPLY

PLEASE RECYCLE

NOTES/COMMENTS:

**FORMAL COMMUNICATION INTENDED FOR  
ENTRY**

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR ENTITY TO WHICH IT IS ADDRESSED, AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAWS. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US IMMEDIATELY BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE ABOVE ADDRESS VIA U.S. POSTAL SERVICE.

THANK YOU.

PTO/SB/21 (08-03)

Approved for use through 08/30/2003. OMB 0851-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

<b>TRANSMITTAL FORM</b> (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	09/709,809	
	Filing Date	November 9, 2000	
	First Named Inventor	Rich Bontrager	
	Art Unit	2854	
	Examiner Name	D.D. Knepper	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	22	Attorney Docket Number	46289015-1482

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 26 2005

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.62 or 1.63	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance communication to Technology Center (TC) <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): Reply to Notice of Non-Compliant Brief
Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT	
Firm or Individual name	Alexander B. Ching, Reg/ No. 41,669
Signature	<i>Alex B. Ching</i>
Date	September 26, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.	
Typed or printed name	Alexander B. Ching, Reg. No. 41,669
Signature	<i>Alexander B. Ching</i>
Date	Sept 26, 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 26 2005

In re application of: Bontrager, Rich

Group Art Unit: 2654

Serial No.: 09/709,809

Examiner: David D. Knepper

Filed: November 9, 2000

Confirmation No.: 4959

For: AUDIO SYNTHESIS OF A CURRENTLY TUNED FREQUENCY

Docket No.: 462-99-015-5542

Customer No.: 000128

**REPLY TO NOTICE OF NON-COMPLIANT BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief mailed on August 25, 2005, Applicant hereby provides a corrected Appeal Brief.

The Examiner indicated the original Appeal Brief was defective because it did not concisely explain the subject matter with respect to the drawings and failed to provide page numbers and line numbers. While Applicant believes sufficient detail was provided to enable the Board to determine quickly where the claimed subject matter is described in the application, additional references to figures and page and line numbers of the application have been added.

The Examiner further argues that the Issue and Grouping of Claims did not appear in the correct order. The Applicant argues that the Appeal Brief headings comply with 37 CFR 41.37, which became effective for appeals on September 13, 2004 and superseded

37 C.F.R. 1.192. The requirement for the contents of an appeal brief is reproduced below:

**§ 41.37 Appeal brief.**

- (a)(1) Appellant must file a brief under this section within two months from the date of filing the notice of appeal under § 41.31.
- (2) The brief must be accompanied by the fee set forth in § 41.20(b)(2).
- (b) On failure to file the brief, accompanied by the requisite fee, within the period specified in paragraph (a) of this section, the appeal will stand dismissed.
- (c)(1) The brief shall contain the following items under appropriate headings and in the order indicated in paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(x) of this section, except that a brief filed by an appellant who is not represented by a registered practitioner need only substantially comply with paragraphs (c)(1)(i) through (c)(1)(iv) and (c)(1)(vii) through (c)(1)(x) of this section:
- (i) *Real party in interest.* A statement identifying by name the real party in interest.
  - (ii) *Related appeals and interferences.* A statement identifying by application, patent, appeal or interference number all other prior and pending appeals, interferences or judicial proceedings known to appellant, the appellant's legal representative, or assignee which may be related to, directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal. Copies of any decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified under this paragraph must be included in an appendix as required by paragraph (c)(1)(x) of this section.
  - (iii) *Status of claims.* A statement of the status of all the claims in the proceeding (e.g., rejected, allowed or confirmed, withdrawn, objected to, canceled) and an identification of those claims that are being appealed.
  - (iv) *Status of amendments.* A statement of the status of any amendment filed subsequent to final rejection.
  - (v) *Summary of claimed subject matter.* A concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which shall refer to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters. For each independent claim involved in the appeal and for each dependent claim argued separately under the provisions of paragraph (c)(1)(vii) of this section, every means plus function and step plus function as permitted by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, must be identified and the structure, material, or acts described in the specification as corresponding to each claimed function must be set forth with reference to the specification by page and line number, and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters.
  - (vi) *Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal.* A concise statement of each ground of rejection presented for review.
  - (vii) *Argument.* The contentions of appellant with respect to each ground of rejection presented for review in paragraph (c)(1)(vi) of this section, and the basis therefor, with citations of the statutes, regulations, authorities, and parts of the record relied on. Any arguments or authorities not included in the brief or a reply brief filed pursuant to § 41.41 will be refused consideration by the Board, unless good cause is shown. Each ground of rejection must be treated under a separate heading. For each ground of rejection applying to two or more claims, the claims may be

argued separately or as a group. When multiple claims subject to the same ground of rejection are argued as a group by appellant, the Board may select a single claim from the group of claims that are argued together to decide the appeal with respect to the group of claims as to the ground of rejection on the basis of the selected claim alone. Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the failure of appellant to separately argue claims which appellant has grouped together shall constitute a waiver of any argument that the Board must consider the patentability of any grouped claim separately. Any claim argued separately should be placed under a subheading identifying the claim by number. Claims argued as a group should be placed under a subheading identifying the claims by number. A statement which merely points out what a claim recites will not be considered an argument for separate patentability of the claim.

- (viii) *Claims appendix*. An appendix containing a copy of the claims involved in the appeal.
- (ix) *Evidence appendix*. An appendix containing copies of any evidence submitted pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the examiner and relied upon by appellant in the appeal, along with a statement setting forth where in the record that evidence was entered in the record by the examiner. Reference to unentered evidence is not permitted in the brief. See § 41.33 for treatment of evidence submitted after copies of the evidence relied upon by the examiner as to grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal.
- (x) *Related proceedings appendix*. An appendix containing copies of decisions rendered by a court or the Board in any proceeding identified pursuant to paragraph (c)(1)(ii) of this section.

Therefore, this ground of objection has been obviated.

The Appeal Brief is in full compliance with all applicable rules and is ready for consideration by the Board. Since the reply was sent within the period of time given by the Examiner and, therefore, no fee is believed due.

Respectfully submitted,



Alexander B. Ching  
Registration No. 41,669

Dated September 26, 2005

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz  
Customer No. 29,906

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

5

In re application of: Bontrager, Rich

Serial No.: 09/709,809

Filed: November 9, 2000

Group Art Unit: 2654

Examiner: David D. Knepper

Confirmation No.: 4959

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**SEP 26 2005**

10

For: AUDIO SYNTHESIS OF A CURRENTLY TUNED FREQUENCY

Docket No.: 462-99-015-5542

Customer No.: 000128

15

**APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

20

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

25

Sir:

This is an Appeal Brief under 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 appealing the final rejection of the Examiner dated November 29, 2004. Each of the topics required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 is presented in this Brief and is labeled appropriately.

30

I. Real Party in Interest

Honeywell International, Inc. ("Honeywell") is the real party in interest of the present application. An assignment of all rights in the present application to Honeywell was executed by the inventor and recorded by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at reel 011767, frame 0207.

5

II. Related Appeals and Interferences

Appellant is not aware of any appeals or interferences related to the present application.

III. Status of Claims

Claims 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40, and 42, which are presented in the Claims Appendix, stand finally rejected. Claims 1-10, 17-22, 30, 33, 39 and 41 have been cancelled. Accordingly, the Appellant hereby appeals the final rejection of claims 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40, and 42.

10

15

IV. Status of Amendments

Following, a first Office Action on the merits dated August 3, 2004; Appellant filed an amendment on May 21, 2004. In the amendment, claims 1-10, 17-22, 30, 33, 39, and 41 were canceled and claims 28, 32, 34, 38, and 40 were amended to more clearly define the invention. In response to this amendment, a final Office Action, dated November 29, 2004, was issued, once again rejecting all of the pending claims. In response to the final Office Action, Appellant filed a response on January 29, 2005, requesting reconsideration of the rejection of claims 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40, and 42. In response to this request, an Advisory Action was issued on March 23, 2005.

20

25

V. Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A system (10) is provided which is receptive to selective tuning at particular frequencies. The system (10) includes a display device (15), an audio synthesizer (14), and a controller (20). The controller (20) is in communication with the display device (15) and the audio synthesizer

30

(14). The controller communicates with the audio synthesizer (14) when a malfunction is detected with respect to the display device (15)(Page 7, paragraph 25, lines 2-3 and page 8, paragraph 26, lines 1-2). In one embodiment, the audio synthesizer (14) produces an audible announcement of a frequency at which the system (10) is currently tuned (Page 8, paragraph 26, lines 2-7).

In another embodiment, an apparatus (10) adapted to be selectively tuned to individual frequencies communicates with an audio synthesizer (14) and a display device (15). The apparatus (10) comprises a processor (20) which: i) detects a first operating mode; ii) tunes the apparatus (10) to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected; iii) controls the audio synthesizer (14) to generate an audio announcement of a frequency at which the apparatus (10) is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is detected; and iv) controls the display device (15) to display a frequency at which the apparatus (10) is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is not detected (Page 7, paragraph 24).

In another embodiment, a method of providing feedback of a first selected setting in a system (10) including a signal receiving device comprises the first step of visually presenting the first selected setting during a first mode (Page 7, paragraph 24, lines 8-10). In a next step, a second selected setting is audibly presented during a second mode. The second selected setting is a default setting that is selected upon failure of a visual display (15) (Page 8, paragraph 27, lines 1-7).

In another embodiment, a method of providing information regarding a system (10) adapted to receive signals over a range of frequencies and adapted to tune to individual frequencies within the range includes a first step of tuning the system (10) to a first frequency. Next, the first frequency during a first mode of operation is visually displayed. Then, the first frequency during a second mode of operation is audibly announced (Page 7, paragraph 24). The second mode of operation is entered upon the inability to visually display the first frequency (Page 7, paragraph 25, lines 1-3).

In another aspect of the invention, a computer executable code that is stored on a computer readable medium can provide information regarding a system (10) adapted to receive signals over a range of frequencies and adapted to tune to individual frequencies within the range (Page 6, paragraph 21, lines 1-6). The code comprises code to tune the system (10) to a first



frequency; visually display the first frequency during a first mode of operation, audibly announce the first frequency during a second mode of operation (Page 8, paragraph 26, lines 1-7); and wherein the second mode of operation entered upon failure to visually display the first frequency (Page 8, paragraph 26, lines 13-16).

5 In another aspect of the present invention, a system (10) that is receptive to selective tuning at particular frequencies comprises a means for displaying and a means for audio synthesizing a frequency signal (Page 9, paragraph 28, lines 8-12). The system (10) further includes a means for controlling communication with said displaying means and said audio synthesizing means (Page 9, paragraph 31, lines 1-6). The said control means communicates  
10 with said audio synthesizing means when a malfunction is detected with respect to said displaying means (Page 10, paragraph 33, lines 1-3).

In another embodiment, a computer executable software code stored on a computer readable medium for use with an apparatus (10) adapted to be selectively tuned to individual frequencies communicates with an audio synthesizer (14) and a display device (15). The said  
15 code comprising code to detect a first operating mode and tune the apparatus (10) to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected (Page 8, paragraph 26, lines 1-7). Additionally the said code comprises code to, if the first operating mode is detected, control the audio synthesizer (14) to generate an audio announcement of a frequency at which the apparatus (10) is currently tuned, and to control the display device (15) to display a frequency at  
20 which the apparatus (10) is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is not detected (Page 7, paragraph 24, line 1-3).

#### VI. Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The grounds of rejection to be reviewed in this appeal are as follows:

25

1. Claims 11-16, 23-27, 40 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,220,681 (Belgin).

2. Claims 28, 29, 31-32, 34-38, 11-16 and 23-27 stands rejected as unpatentable over *Belgin* in view of an IEEE article entitled "Integrated Communication, Radio, Navigation, and Identification" (Sinay).

5

## VII. ARGUMENT

### A. CLAIMS 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40 AND 42 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER *BELGIN*

10 In the final Office Action dated August 24, 2004, claims 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40 and 42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over *Belgin* and in view of, presumably, what is known in the art. As will be explained in more detail herein below, these rejections are not tenable at least because elements recited in independent claims 11, 23, 40 and 42 are not found in the cited references. Also, the rejection is based on hindsight reconstruction.

15

#### 1. Belgin

*Belgin* discloses a decoding and display mechanism wherein the encoded audio output can be monitored through the pilot's headset or other speaker. In *Belgin*, encoded audio signals are received by a signal input port (11) which couples to a tunable filter/frequency discriminator unit (10) to filter the encode signal. The filtered encode signal is then received by a microprocessor-based decoder (20) which decodes the symbols of the encoded audio signal and generates a set of output signals representative of the alpha-numeric abbreviation of the source of the channel being monitored. This set of output signals is then used to drive a digital display (50) or speech synthesizer (60), so that the pilot may be provided with the identification of the source of the monitored channel. (Column 3, lines 18-63). The system generates a warning upon two occurrences: (1) a loss of signal (signal too low to detect) or (2) a loss of power. (column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 6).

25

#### 2. Analysis

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner has the burden of setting forth a detailed evidentiary basis for the teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the cited references. As the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit recently reiterated, the factual inquiry of whether to combine references must be thorough and searching, and must be based upon objective evidence of record. In re Sang Su Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Moreover, a claim cannot be found *prima facie* obvious unless all the elements of the claim are taught or suggested in the cited art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974); In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (C.C.P.A. 1970) ("All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art."). Just because a prior art reference *can* be modified does not render the proposed modification obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of making the proposed modification. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Appellants submit that the Examiner has not met his burden, since the references do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements.

In the final Office Action the Examiner argues that *Belgin* discloses a display unit, a speech synthesizer, and a computer which controls feedback to the display unit and speech synthesizer. The Examiner admits that *Belgin* does not explicitly teach that the "controller communicates with said audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to said display device." The Examiner argues, however, that since *Belgin* teaches monitoring for loss of signal or power it would be obvious to one of skill in the art to include monitoring for loss of a display device. The Examiner further argues that the motivation to alter *Belgin* comes from the fact that because *Belgin* teaches it is important to augment prior art avionics equipment to allow for an indication of what frequency the radio is tuned through a display unit or speech synthesizer, one of skill in the art, knowing that *Belgin* also teaches the monitoring of the power supply and the discriminator unit for malfunction, would expect *Belgin* to be able to detect and react to a malfunction in the display unit.

This argument is pure hindsight reconstruction. Nothing in *Belgin* discloses, teaches, or suggests the monitoring of the display device for failure or communication with an audio synthesizer in result of a failure of the display device. Only the Applicant's application contains such limitations. Indeed, *Belgin*, at column 4, lines 1-6, clearly states that only the operation of

the tunable filter/frequency discriminator unit and the power supply are monitored and at column 7, lines 39-50, *Belgin* discloses that in response to a failure of the tunable filter/frequency discriminator unit, a warning message is generated and in response to a power supply failure, a warning message is generated and the system powers down to a minimal level. There is nothing in *Belgin* to lead one of skill in the art to expect a system that "communicates with said audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to the said display device." The Examiner argues that *Belgin* discloses that it is important to augment prior art avionics equipment to allow indication of the frequency to which the radio is tuned (column 2, lines 45-49) and this provides motivation to alter *Belgin*. However, the section of *Belgin* cited by the Examiner merely states the invention of *Belgin* can be used in different types of radios. It does not provide motivation to provide a controller that communicates with the audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to the display device as in claim 11.

Additionally, assuming arguendo that if one of skill in the art could find motivation to provide for a failure in the display device or voice synthesizer from the *Belgin* reference, there is no teaching or suggestion that when there is a failure of the display the response is to communicate with the audio synthesizer as claimed by the Applicant. There are other ways of responding to the failure in the display device or audio synthesizer, such as providing a backup display. Thus, even if there is a suggestion to modify *Belgin* to provide for failures in the display device or audio synthesizer, none of the art of record provides motivation or suggestion to modify *Belgin* in the exact same way as laid out in the Applicant's claims. In the end there is but one conclusion; the only motivation to alter the prior art to include a controller that "communicates with said audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to the said display device" is the Applicant's patent application. Because this rejection is based on hindsight reconstruction, it must be withdrawn.

The Examiner's final argument with regard to claim 11 is that since *Belgin* states that "control adjustments are readily effected by way of a straightforward modification of the control software through which microcontroller 20 supervises operation of the system" and since one of ordinary skill in this art has a high level of skill, any known adjustment are obvious.

This argument is flawed for several reasons. First, the argument exaggerates the importance and scope of the section of *Belgin* quoted by the Examiner. The section quoted by the Examiner states:

5 The front panel switches may be employed to externally control a number of operational parameters of the system, such as whether to display station identification or the actual code contained within the monitored signal of interest, display intensity, the intensity of the audio output of speech synthesizer 60, etc. As in the case of other operational aspects of the system, such as the frequency spectrum boundaries delineated above, 10 neither the type nor number of parameters that are controlled by way of the switch panel 40 are to be considered limited to the examples presented here. Control adjustments are readily effected by way of a straightforward modification of the control software through which microcontroller 20 supervises operation of the system. (column 4, lines 56 to column 5, line 15 9).

Thus, what *Belgin* is discussing is adjustment to the controls such as the front panel switch controls. *Belgin* is not disclosing that other systems, aside from the frequency discriminator and the battery, should be monitored.

20 Additionally, the Examiner states that skill level of one of ordinary skill in the art would be very high in the field of endeavor and that this high level of skill in the art is enough to provide motivation to add the limitations of the Applicant's invention to *Belgin*. However, reliance on the level of skill in the art to provide motivation is impermissible. MPEP 2143.01. Therefore, for these reasons the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

25 Independent claim 23 stands rejected by the Examiner for the same reason as claim 11. Additionally, the Examiner argues that a second operating mode is taught in column 7, lines 40-45 where the system of *Belgin* detects a loss of signal or a too weak signal and provides a loss of signal announcement.

30 The arguments concerning claim 11 apply to claim 23 as well. For at least this reason claim 23 is in condition for allowance. Further, *Belgin* does not teach a system that "detects a first operating mode" and that "tunes the apparatus to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected." The Examiner argues that a second operating mode corresponds to a loss of signal or a signal that is too weak and providing an announcement of the loss of station. However, the Examiner fails to address that *Belgin* fails to disclose, teach or suggest a system 35 that is able to detect a first operating mode and to tunes the apparatus to a predetermined

frequency, if the first operating mode is detected. shows a first operating mode. Even with that adjustment to the Examiner's argument, these limitations are not found in *Belgin*. Further, the Examiner has provided no other prior art that discloses such a limitation. Therefore, for at least this reason, claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

5        Considering independent claim 40, claim 40 is also rejected for the reasons outlined with respect to claim 11. Therefore, for the reasons discussed in conjunction with claim 11, claim 40 is in condition for allowance.

      Considering independent claim 42, claim 42 is also rejected for the reasons outlined with respect to claim 11. Therefore, for the reasons discussed in conjunction with claim 11, claim 42  
10 is in condition for allowance.

B.     CLAIMS 28, 29, 31-32, 34-38 ARE NOT UNPATENTABLE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 OVER BELGIN AND SINAY.

15

      The final Office Action of November 29, 2004, also rejected claims 28, 29, 31-32, 34-38, under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Belgin* in view of Integrated Communication, Radio, Navigation, and Identification (*Sinay*). It is unclear if the Examiner also intends claims 11-16 and 23-27. The Examiner listed these claims as part of the claims that stand rejected with  
20 this art. However, the rejection never specifically describes how the rejection applies to claims 11-16 and 23-27. However, whether claims 11-16 and 23-27 are part of the rejected claims is unimportant since the addition of *Sinay* fails to overcome the short comings of the *Belgin* reference.

25

1.     *Belgin*

*Belgin* was described above, and will therefore not be described further.

2.     *Sinay*

*Sinay* teaches an integrated system for aircrafts that controls certain flight communication and  
30 navigational functions through a communication and radio navigation controller. *Sinay* also

states that a backup control unit is coupled to the same units as communication and radio navigation controller. If there is a failure in communications between the communication and radio navigation controller and the redundant systems and the individual flight control elements the communication and radio navigation controller controls. Or if the main display screen fails, control is routed to a backup controller and a backup screen are desirable (*Sinay*, p. 425, column 2). From this reading of *Sinay*, it is the control functions, such as those used by the pilot, that are backed-up. Additionally, in the event of a display failure another display is used.

### 3. Analysis

Note, that since the *Belgin* reference fails to teach all of the limitations of the independent claims and since the obviousness argument under *Belgin* is based on hindsight reconstruction, the addition of *Sinay* do not overcome the shortcomings of *Belgin*. For this reason alone, the rejection under the proposed *Belgin/Sinay* combination should be withdrawn.

Additionally, the proposed *Belgin/Sinay* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest disclose, “visually presenting the first selected setting during a first mode” and “audibly presenting a second selected setting during a second mode, the second selected setting a default setting that is selected upon failure of a visual display” as is disclosed in claim 28.

Additionally, claim 28, recites, in part “visually presenting the first selected setting during a first mode” and “audibly presenting a second selected setting during a second mode, the second selected setting a default setting that is selected upon failure of a visual display.” The *Belgin/Sinay* combination fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a default setting different from a first selected setting being audibly presented. For at least these reason, claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

Also, the proposed *Belgin/Sinay* combination fails to disclose teach or suggest “audibly announcing the first frequency during a second mode of operation; and the second mode of operation entered upon the inability to visually display the first frequency”, as disclosed in independent claim 32.

Further, the proposed *Belgin/Sinay* combination fails to disclose, teach or suggest “visually display the first frequency during a first mode of operation; audibly announce the first

frequency during a second mode of operation; and the second mode of operation entered upon failure to visually display the first frequency", as in independent claim 38.

Considering claims 11-16 and 23-27, it has already been discussed how *Belgin*, in view of what is presumably of common knowledge to one of skill in the art, fails to teach all of the  
 5 limitations of the claims and how the combination is based on hindsight reconstruction. For independent claim 11, *Sinay* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest "communicates with said audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to said display device."

For independent claim 23, *Sinay* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest detecting "a first  
 10 operating mode" that "tunes the apparatus to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected." For at least this reason, claims 11 and 23 are allowable.




## VIII. CONCLUSION OF ARGUMENTS

In view of the foregoing, Appellant submits that the final rejection of Claims 11-16, 23-29, 31-32, 34-38, 40, and 42 are improper and should not be sustained. Therefore, a reversal of the rejections in the final Office Action dated November 29, 2004 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

10

Dated September 26, 2005  
Alexander Ching  
Registration No. 41,669

15

Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz  
Customer No. 29,906

## VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

### Claims on Appeal

5           11.    A system receptive to selective tuning to particular frequencies, said system comprising:

          a display device;

          an audio synthesizer; and

          a controller in communication with said display device and said audio synthesizer,

10   wherein said controller communicates with said audio synthesizer when a malfunction is detected with respect to said display device.

          12.    A system according to claim 11, wherein said controller comprises an electronic processor circuit.

15           13.    A system according to claim 11, wherein said audio synthesizer audibly synthesizes a frequency at which said system is currently tuned.

          14.    A system according to claim 11, wherein said system comprises a navigation  
20   system.

          15.    A system according to claim 11, wherein said system comprises a communications system.

25           16.    A system according to claim 11, wherein said system comprises a navigation and communications system.

23. An apparatus adapted to be selectively tuned to individual frequencies, said apparatus communicating with an audio synthesizer and a display device, said apparatus comprising:

5 a processor which: i) detects a first operating mode; ii) tunes the apparatus to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected; iii) controls the audio synthesizer to generate an audio announcement of a frequency at which the apparatus is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is detected; and iv) controls the display device to display a frequency at which the apparatus is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is not detected.

10 24. The apparatus according to claim 23, wherein said processor programs the audio synthesizer, if the first operating mode is detected.

25. The apparatus according to claim 24, wherein said processor tunes the radio to a selected frequency.

15

26. The apparatus according to claim 25, wherein after tuning the radio, said processor waits for the frequency to change.

20 27. The apparatus according to claim 23, wherein the first operating mode corresponds to a failure of the display device.

28. A method of providing feedback of a first selected setting in a system including a signal receiving device, said method comprising the steps of:

25 visually presenting the first selected setting during a first mode; and audibly presenting a second selected setting during a second mode, the second selected setting a default setting that is selected upon failure of a visual display.

29. A method according to claim 28, further comprising the step of determining the termination of the first mode.

30

31. A method according to claim 28, wherein the first selected setting comprises a frequency.

32. A method of providing information regarding a system, the system adapted to receive signals over a range of frequencies and adapted to tune to individual frequencies within the range, said method comprising the steps of:

tuning the system to a first frequency;  
visually displaying the first frequency during a first mode of operation;  
audibly announcing the first frequency during a second mode of operation; and  
the second mode of operation entered upon the inability to visually display the first frequency.

34. A method according to claim 32, wherein upon entering the second mode of operation, said method further comprises the steps of resetting the system to a predetermined frequency, and audibly announcing the predetermined frequency.

35. A method according to claim 32, further comprising the step of audibly announcing the first frequency during the first mode of operation.

36. A method according to claim 32, wherein said system comprises any one of a navigation system, a communications system and a navigation/communications system.

37. A method according to claim 36, wherein said system is for use in an aircraft.

38. Computer executable code stored on a computer readable medium, the code to provide information regarding a system, the system adapted to receive signals over a range of frequencies and adapted to tune to individual frequencies within the range, said code comprising code to:

tune the system to a first frequency;  
visually display the first frequency during a first mode of operation;

audibly announce the first frequency during a second mode of operation; and  
the second mode of operation entered upon failure to visually display the first frequency.

40. A system receptive to selective tuning at particular frequencies, said system  
5 comprising:  
means for displaying;  
means for audio synthesizing a frequency signal; and  
means for controlling communication with said displaying means and said audio  
synthesizing means, wherein said control means communicates with said audio synthesizing  
10 means when a malfunction is detected with respect to said displaying means.

42. Computer executable software code stored on a computer readable medium, the  
code for use with an apparatus adapted to be selectively tuned to individual frequencies, the  
15 apparatus communicating with an audio synthesizer and a display device, said code comprising  
code to:  
detect a first operating mode;  
tune the apparatus to a predetermined frequency, if the first operating mode is detected;  
control the audio synthesizer to generate an audio announcement of a frequency at which  
20 the apparatus is currently tuned, if the first operating mode is detected; and  
control the display device to display a frequency at which the apparatus is currently  
tuned, if the first operating mode is not detected.

**IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

No evidence pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 has been entered by the Examiner or relied upon by Appellant in the instant appeal.

**X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

As there are no related appeals and interferences, there are also no decisions rendered by a court or the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences that are related to the instant appeal.